

1
2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Pete Anthony Valenzuela,
10 Petitioner,
11 v.
12 Charles L Ryan, et al.,
13 Respondents.
14

No. CV-15-01895-PHX-ROS

ORDER

15 Petitioner Pete Anthony Valenzuela filed a *pro se* petition for habeas corpus
16 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, raising three claims. (Doc. 1). Magistrate Judge John Z.
17 Boyle filed a Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) that the petition be dismissed with
18 prejudice. (Doc. 9). Valenzuela filed a timely objection. (Doc. 11). The Court will adopt
19 the R & R with comments.

20 **BACKGROUND**

21 Valenzuela was charged with two counts of Burglary in the Second Degree. (Doc.
22 7-1, Exh. B at 8). He pled guilty to one count. (Doc. 7-1, Exh. C at 11). His *pro se* post-
23 conviction relief (“PCR”) petition was denied on December 12, 2014¹, and the Arizona
24 Court of Appeals dismissed his petition for review, filed January 27, 2015, as untimely.
25 (Doc. 14 at 2). He then filed the present habeas petition, raising three claims:

- 26 1. The charges in the indictment were multiplicitous.

27
28 ¹ The order itself is dated December 12, 2014, but is stamped filed December 15, 2014. This discrepancy does not affect the Court of Appeals’ timeliness ruling, since the applicable rule gives 30 days to file a petition for review. Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.9(c).

2. Warrantless search and seizure of his vehicle.
 3. Ineffective assistance of counsel in the forms of:
 - a) failing to contest the indictment,
 - b) failing to challenge the stop and arrest,
 - c) refusing to take his case to trial.

(Doc. 1 at 6-8). The R & R recommends finding Valenzuela, by pleading guilty, waived the first two claims, as well as the first two bases for the third claim. (Doc. 9 at 6-7). In his objection, Valenzuela argues a guilty plea does not void prior constitutional violations in the criminal process. (Doc. 11 at 4).

The R & R construed the claim of ineffective assistance of counsel for refusing to take his case to trial as a claim that Valenzuela's plea was involuntary. (Doc. 9 at 7-8). It recommended holding the claim is procedurally defaulted because it was not fairly presented in state court. (*Id* at 8). Valenzuela did not directly address that section of the R & R in his objection.

DISCUSSION

I. Legal Standards

The Court “shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). It “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” *Id.* The Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).

Generally, a federal court cannot grant relief on a claim that was not exhausted in the state courts. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b). In Arizona, this means petitioners must present their post-conviction relief claims to the Arizona Court of Appeals. *See Swoopes v. Sublett*, 196 F.3d 1008, 1010 (9th Cir. 1999) (per curiam). “[A] federal court will not review the merits of claims, including constitutional claims, that a state court declined to hear because the prisoner failed to abide by a state procedural rule.” *Martinez v. Ryan*,

1 132 S. Ct. 1309, 1316 (2012). A petitioner may overcome such a procedural default by
 2 showing “cause and prejudice” for the default “or, alternatively, a fundamental
 3 miscarriage of justice.” *Beaty v. Stewart*, 303 F.3d 975, 987 (9th Cir. 2002). “Cause” may
 4 be shown in a number of ways, including ineffective assistance in post-conviction
 5 proceedings. *Martinez*, 132 S. Ct. at 1315.

6 **II. Valenzuela’s Guilty Plea Waived the Search and Seizure Claim**

7 Valenzuela claims the indictment was multiplicitous and his arrest and the search
 8 of his vehicle were unconstitutional. (Doc. 1 at 6-7). In his objection to the R & R, he
 9 argues a guilty plea does not affect his ability to challenge these allegedly
 10 unconstitutional features of his criminal proceeding. (Doc. 11 at 4). This is incorrect as a
 11 matter of law, at least as to the search and seizure claim. “[W]hen a defendant is
 12 convicted pursuant to his guilty plea rather than a trial, the validity of that conviction
 13 cannot be affected by an alleged Fourth Amendment violation because the conviction
 14 does not rest in any way on evidence that may have been improperly seized.” *Haring v.*
 15 *Prosise*, 462 U.S. 306, 321 (1983). The search and seizure claims is therefore waived.

16 **III. The Counts in the Indictment Were Not Multiplicitous**

17 As to multiplicity, the first issue is whether Valenzuela has waived the argument,
 18 as the R & R would hold. As the R & R notes, “[w]hen a criminal defendant has solemnly
 19 admitted in open court that he is in fact guilty of the offense with which he is charged, he
 20 may not thereafter raise independent claims relating to the deprivation of constitutional
 21 rights that occurred prior to the entry of the guilty plea.” *Tollett v. Henderson*, 411 U.S.
 22 258, 267 (1973). This is because “a guilty plea represents a break in the chain of events
 23 which has preceded it in the criminal process.” *Tollett*, 411 U.S. at 267. However, the
 24 Supreme Court later clarified that “[a] guilty plea, therefore, simply renders irrelevant
 25 those constitutional violations not logically inconsistent with the valid establishment of
 26 factual guilt and which do not stand in the way of conviction if factual guilt is validly
 27 established.” *Menna v. New York*, 423 U.S. 61, 63 n.2 (1975). Thus, “a plea of guilty to a
 28 charge does not waive a claim that judged on its face the charge is one which the State

1 may not constitutionally prosecute.” *Id.* Multiplicity may be such a claim. However,
 2 because the multiplicity claim would fail on its merits (see below), the Court need not
 3 decide whether it is waived.

4 Another threshold question is whether multiplicitous counts in an indictment
 5 present a constitutional violation if the defendant is only convicted of one count. One
 6 authority believes “[i]t remains permissible to charge a single offense in several counts
 7 (although not to convict and punish on more than one for a single crime).” 1A C. Wright
 8 & A. Leipold, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 142 (4th ed. 2016). This authority has
 9 rarely been cited for that proposition, however, and never by the Ninth Circuit or a
 10 district court therein, and its roots are in dicta from *United States v. Universal C. I. T.*
 11 *Credit Corp.*, 344 U.S. 218 (1952). There, the Court stated, “a draftsman of an indictment
 12 may charge crime in a variety of forms to avoid fatal variance of the evidence. He may
 13 cast the indictment in several counts whether the body of facts upon which the indictment
 14 is based gives rise to only one criminal offense or to more than one.” *Id.* at 225. If this is
 15 correct, Valenzuela may very well have no multiplicity claim since he was only convicted
 16 of one count.

17 Even assuming Valenzuela has not waived his claim and that a multiplicitous
 18 indictment itself violates Valenzuela’s constitutional rights, the claim fails. Valenzuela
 19 argues the two burglary counts were from a “single crime.” (Doc. 1 at 6). However, the
 20 indictment lists under each of the two counts a unique residence and unique victims. (*Id.*
 21 at 14). It thus appears he was charged for two separate burglaries, and Valenzuela has not
 22 demonstrated otherwise. The multiplicity claim is therefore denied.

23 **IV. The Ineffective Assistance of Counsel Claims are Procedurally Defaulted**

24 Because Valenzuela does not object to the R & R’s finding that his ineffective
 25 assistance of counsel (“IAC”) claims are procedurally defaulted, the Court may
 26 summarily adopt the R & R on this issue. It does so as to the first and second IAC claims.
 27 However, one point of clarification is worth making as to the third claim. As noted, the R
 28 & R construed this claim – counsel refused to take the case to trial – as a claim of an

1 involuntary guilty plea. Although the R & R is not entirely clear on this point, the Court
 2 understands the R & R to have construed the claim this way because it implicitly
 3 concluded the IAC claims were procedurally defaulted, and so this analysis was in the
 4 alternative. To be clear, all three IAC claims are defaulted because they were dismissed
 5 by the Arizona Court of Appeals due to the untimeliness of his appeal. (Doc. 14 at 2).
 6 This Court's analysis from a prior habeas case applies:

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

If Petitioner were to appeal [the denial of PCR relief] now, review would be precluded for untimeliness. *See Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.9(c)* (petition for review of PCR determination must be filed within thirty days after the final decision of the trial court). If Petitioner were to raise any of the habeas claims through a [second] PCR, the PCR would be summarily dismissed for untimeliness. *See Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.4(a)* (except for narrow exceptions, a PCR must be filed within ninety days of entry of judgment); *see also Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.1(d)-(h)*. Because Petitioner is prevented from exhausting his habeas claims by an independent and adequate state law ground, exhaustion is impossible and the claims are procedurally defaulted. *See Smith v. Stewart*, 241 F.3d 1191, 1995 n.2 (9th Cir. 2001) (Rule 32 procedural bar is “regularly followed” and thus adequate), *rev’d on other grounds by Stewart v. Smith*, 536 U.S. 856, 122 S. Ct. 2578, 153 L.Ed.2d 762 (2002).

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329


1 constitutional violation has probably resulted in the conviction of one who is actually
2 innocent." *Murray v. Carrier*, 477 U.S. 478, 496 (1986). Valenzuela has not claimed he
3 was innocent of the burglary. The cause and prejudice exception depends upon
4 Valenzuela showing "some objective factor external to the defense impeded [his] efforts
5 to comply with the State's procedural rule" on appealing PCR rulings. *Id.* at 488. He has
6 not so much as alleged any external factor, including ineffective assistance in the post-
7 conviction proceedings.

8 Accordingly,

9 **IT IS ORDERED** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 9)
10 is **ADOPTED**.

11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** Petitioner's Application for Writ of Habeas
12 Corpus (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. The Clerk of Court shall close
13 this case.

14 Dated this 3rd day of October, 2016.



15
16
17 Honorable Roslyn O. Silver
18 Senior United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28